

SPECIFICATION

Docket No. 0635MH-40913

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

BE IT KNOWN that we, * and *, residing in the State of *, have invented new and useful improvements in a

METHOD OF COMBINING SHARED BUFFERS OF CONTINUOUS DIGITAL MEDIA DATA WITH MEDIA DELIVERY SCHEDULING

of which the following is a specification:

CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS

1 The present application claims priority from US Provisional application
2 60/199,567, filed 4/25/00.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

3 1. Field of the Invention:

4 The present invention is in the field of digital communications systems,
5 and more particularly, communications systems which transport continuous
6 digital media such as audio and video.

7 2. Description of the Prior Art:

8 One of the most important forms of information in digital communications
9 systems is continuous media, exemplified by digital audio and digital video. An
10 example application would be transmission of a movie or live information
11 between a service provider and a user. The traditional method of providing such
12 a service is the *broadcast network*, exemplified by broadcast television or cable
13 television. Models for future information systems use the concept of integrated
14 services, where voice, video and structured information services such as the
15 world-wide web (WWW) are delivered over a single logical transport service, the
16 packet-switched Internet.

17 To use such a system, the audio and video information must be encoded
18 in digital form, and packetized. To reduce the use of network resources, the

1 information might be first encoded in digital form and then compressed. The
2 advantage of compression is a significant reduction in data volume, while the
3 disadvantage is the complexity of the algorithms required for encoding and
4 decoding the compressed information. For example, directly encoding NTSC
5 signals from a television system requires about 100 megabits/second of
6 bandwidth, meaning that a two hour video, at 720 megabytes per minute, would
7 require about 100 gigabytes of storage. Encoding the signals using the MPEG 2
8 compression scheme typically reduces the bandwidth required to about 1.5
9 megabits/second, or 12 megabytes per minute. With such compression an entire
10 2 hour movie could be stored in about 1.5 gigabytes of storage. MPEG 2 is
11 designed to require significantly more computation to encode than to decode, as
12 it is presumed that service providers can afford to perform the expensive
13 operations once, in order that the inexpensive decoding operations can be
14 performed many times by receivers. This assumption is clearly true for a stored
15 video, where the encoding is done once and then decoding is done whenever the
16 video is viewed.

17 When a system is constructed to distribute digitized continuous media to
18 many users, there are a number of attractive opportunities for architectural
19 techniques which can reduce system load in addition to any gains achieved by
20 operations performed on the media such as efficient coding. In particular, a
21 powerful technique is *multicast*, where the information is not sent to all possible
22 recipients, but rather those who indicate interest, perhaps by subscription. To the
23 degree that sharing can be achieved, e.g., the sharing of a viewing service which

1 plays the video into the network, significant savings can be realized. For
2 example, rather than sending multiple copies of the same video stream, each at
3 1.5 megabits/second to a significant population of users, the video might be sent
4 once via multicast to the set.

5 Multicasts are typically represented as acyclic directed graphs called
6 *trees*, where the server lies at the root of the tree, there are a set of intermediate
7 *nodes* interconnected by network *links* which transport information to *leaf nodes*,
8 at which are located users. A key feature of the intermediate nodes is their ability
9 to replicate information to several nodes in the direction of the information flow,
10 so that eventually the information travels from the server to all interested leaves.

11 This basic model assumes that the users are all interested in receiving the
12 same information at the same time, *e.g.*, a “scheduled” time for a broadcast
13 event, such as a sports event or a concert. When users join the multicast at
14 some later time, they may lose the first part of the event (which they may be
15 interested in) as it is not saved (or “buffered”). For viewing of archived material,
16 such as replays of videos on demand, the points at which users are interested
17 and start the viewing will vary sufficiently that multiple time-skewed copies of the
18 digital continuous media may be being served to users at any given time.

19 The difficulties with this situation are two-fold. First, the server is busy
20 sending and resending multiple multicast streams of essentially the same
21 information. Second, the advantages of multicast accrue to the degree that
22 information is replicated – *unicast*, or point-to-point transmission, can be consider

1 a degenerate case of multicast, and in fact will be the case when there is no
2 shared interest in a continuous media stream. Thus, to the degree in which we
3 can aggregate demand for continuous media streams, we can optimize overall
4 system performance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

1 In accordance with the present invention, a communications method utilizes
2 memory areas to buffer portions of the media streams. These buffer areas are
3 shared by user applications, with the desirable consequence of reducing
4 workload for the server system distributing media to the user (client) applications.
5 The preferred method allows optimal balancing of buffering delays and server
6 loads, as well as optimal choice of buffer contents for the shared memory buffers.

0635MH-40913 Patent Application

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

1 The novel features believed characteristic of the invention are set forth in the
2 appended claims. The invention itself however, as well as a preferred mode of use,
3 further objects and advantages thereof, will best be understood by reference to the
4 following detailed description of an illustrative embodiment when read in
5 conjunction with the accompanying drawings, wherein:

6 Figure 1 is a block diagram illustrating multicast over a network;

7 Figure 2 illustrates shared use of a buffer;

8 Figure 3 is a diagram illustrating use of a double buffer; and

9 Figure 4 is a timing diagram illustrating buffer sharing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENT

1 It will be appreciated by those skilled in the art that the following
2 description illustrates techniques that can be utilized in various types of systems.
3 The preferred embodiment is described in the context of an internet system such
4 as is generally known in the art.

5 MULTICAST TRAFFIC

6 In a store-and-forward packet-switched network, multicast is effected by
7 multicasting the packets of data as they arrive at a node in the multicast tree. In
8 practice, the node is a switch, router or other device which receives a multicast
9 packet on an input port, and sends the packet on one or more output ports in
10 accordance with the topology of the graph describing the multicast of the data to
11 users. A multicast from a server to a number of users is illustrated in **Figure 1**.

12 To perform this operation, the packet must be stored in a buffer memory.
13 In practice, the buffer memory may contain a *queue* of multiple packets. In the
14 continuous media case, a queue containing a sequence of packets represents a
15 segment of the continuous media stream. When the queue consists of large
16 numbers of packets, substantial storage of media can be achieved within the
17 constraints of the node's memory capacity.

18 While it is often the case that the buffering is mainly used to effect flow
19 control, that is, to mitigate rate differences between senders and receivers, the
20 presence of buffering capability in nodes allows other optimizations where the

1 buffer capacity, *e.g.*, the queued packets, can be shared or reused effectively.
2 The advantage of sharing and reuse is that once the packet has been transmitted
3 to a buffer, it need not be transmitted from the server to service a user if the user
4 can be satisfied with the buffer contents rather than with an additional
5 independent stream sent by the server.

6 The difficulty in buffer reuse is independent start times for the multicast
7 streams, as what is in the queue of packets destined to a particular user may not
8 be the same data as that required by another user. To the degree that work (*e.g.*,
9 the transmission of data from one node to another) can be avoided through
10 sharing, the system will perform better. An example of better performance would
11 be more concurrent users operating with a reduction in bandwidth relative to
12 similar systems.

13 SHARED BUFFERS

14 Each segment of buffered continuous media represents the result of work done
15 by the network to transport the digitized continuous media to the buffer. Thus, to
16 the degree that the contents of the buffer can be shared, the work of transporting
17 the continuous media to the buffer can be shared. An essential observation is
18 that there is a clear relationship between buffer occupancy and time: each buffer
19 segment of size **B** bytes represents a playout time of **B/R** seconds, where **R** is
20 the encoding rate in bytes per second. A related observation was made in John
21 H. Shaffer, "The Effects of High Speed Networks on Wide Area Distributed
22 Systems", *Ph.D. Thesis*, CIS, University of Pennsylvania, 1996.

1 The central observation used in our approach is that if additional viewers
2 arrive within **B/R** seconds of the start time of the original playout, these additional
3 viewers can utilize the contents of the buffer segment rather than requiring
4 additional network bandwidth for transmission. To be specific, if the arrival time of
5 viewers V1 and V2 is separated by less than **B/R**, they can share a buffer
6 segment. This is illustrated in **Figure 2**.

7 While a related idea was employed in U. Legezda, D. Wetherall and J.
8 Guttag, "*Active Reliable Multicast*", Proc. Infocomm 1998, SF, CA to reduce
9 required bandwidth in a reliable multicast, the sharing was different, in that it was
10 used for recovery of lost multicast packets rather than as a support mechanism
11 for multicast of digital continuous media. The key basic point of our method is the
12 use of a per-recipient pointer (an index) into the shared buffer to reflect the
13 differences in start times. By use of this pointer, the buffer contents can be
14 effectively shared.

15 There are a variety of parameters which can be adjusted in the design of
16 such a system. First, to the degree that whole instances of digital continuous
17 media (for convenience, we will call these "files") can be buffered, there is
18 significant advantage to be had in that the buffer management algorithms are
19 simplified. This is because the algorithms need to spend less effort managing the
20 differences in buffer refresh rate caused by supporting multiple start times. This
21 management cost is incurred if the whole file is not available, as to save
22 bandwidth, the buffer contents must be retained until the last viewer is done with
23 them, *i.e.*, their pointer has advanced to the end of the buffer. This problem is

1 easily addressed if the well-known technique of *double-buffering* is employed to
2 manage two buffers of size **B** and the start time deltas are limited to **B/R**, as
3 above. In the double-buffering technique, one buffer is drained by the viewers
4 while the other is filled from the network, and this solution allows the time-
5 separated viewers to share the **2*B** space. The technique is illustrated in **Figure**
6 **3**.

7 The same effect can be achieved by limiting the time differences between
8 V1 and V2 to **B/(2*R)**.

9 OPTIMAL SHARING OF A SINGLE BUFFER

10 There are a variety of techniques for buffer management which can make
11 use of the buffer capacity to better store continuous digital media. To review
12 some of the techniques used in US Patent 5,754,938, issued May 19, 1998 to
13 Herz et al, and US Application No. 09/024,278, filed Feb 17, 1998, both hereby
14 incorporated by reference hereinto, the buffer contents can be:

- 15 1. Selected based on statistical modeling of the user based on similarity
16 measures derived from previous viewing.
- 17 2. Can be *prefetched* in advance of viewing demand in order to smooth
18 demands on bandwidth.
- 19 3. Can be *prefetched* in anticipation if possible viewing demand based on
20 similarity measures for the viewers sharing the buffer.

1 4. Can be *retained* in anticipation of new viewers requesting the stream
2 based on similarity measures for users sharing the buffer.

3 While we incorporate by reference the two Herz, *et al.* patents, we wish to
4 expand slightly here on point 4. This point suggests that the contents of a buffer
5 should be retained even after all current viewers have viewed the content *if* either
6 there is no demand for the space it is occupying from other content requests, or if
7 the likelihood that it will be used again soon is higher than the likelihood that any
8 prefetched content will be used soon. In effect, the retention decision is one
9 which takes advantage of the fact that a desirable prefetch is *already in the*
10 *buffer*. Excepting this observation, the similarity measures and analysis are
11 included by reference to the other patent and filing.

12 The single buffer case is then optimized by the following algorithm, applied
13 at each discrete time step in the buffer's existence:

14 1. If the buffer is being used by one or more viewers, examine another
15 buffer.

16 2. If the buffer has been used recently, estimate the probability that it will
17 be reused in the near future (e.g., a time interval such as **B/R**). If it is
18 likely, examine another buffer and mark the buffer "RETAINED".

19 3. If the buffer is marked "EMPTY", and a non-"DOUBLED BUFFERED"
20 buffer is being used by the maximum number of viewers, fetch the next

SPECIFICATION

Docket No. 0635MH-40913

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

BE IT KNOWN that we, * and *, residing in the State of *, have invented new and useful improvements in a

METHOD OF COMBINING SHARED BUFFERS OF CONTINUOUS DIGITAL MEDIA DATA WITH MEDIA DELIVERY SCHEDULING

of which the following is a specification:

CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS

1 The present application claims priority from US Provisional application
2 60/199,567, filed 4/25/00.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

3 1. Field of the Invention:

4 The present invention is in the field of digital communications systems,
5 and more particularly, communications systems which transport continuous
6 digital media such as audio and video.

7 2. Description of the Prior Art:

8 One of the most important forms of information in digital communications
9 systems is continuous media, exemplified by digital audio and digital video. An
10 example application would be transmission of a movie or live information
11 between a service provider and a user. The traditional method of providing such
12 a service is the *broadcast network*, exemplified by broadcast television or cable
13 television. Models for future information systems use the concept of integrated
14 services, where voice, video and structured information services such as the
15 world-wide web (WWW) are delivered over a single logical transport service, the
16 packet-switched Internet.

17 To use such a system, the audio and video information must be encoded
18 in digital form, and packetized. To reduce the use of network resources, the

1 information might be first encoded in digital form and then compressed. The
2 advantage of compression is a significant reduction in data volume, while the
3 disadvantage is the complexity of the algorithms required for encoding and
4 decoding the compressed information. For example, directly encoding NTSC
5 signals from a television system requires about 100 megabits/second of
6 bandwidth, meaning that a two hour video, at 720 megabytes per minute, would
7 require about 100 gigabytes of storage. Encoding the signals using the MPEG 2
8 compression scheme typically reduces the bandwidth required to about 1.5
9 megabits/second, or 12 megabytes per minute. With such compression an entire
10 2 hour movie could be stored in about 1.5 gigabytes of storage. MPEG 2 is
11 designed to require significantly more computation to encode than to decode, as
12 it is presumed that service providers can afford to perform the expensive
13 operations once, in order that the inexpensive decoding operations can be
14 performed many times by receivers. This assumption is clearly true for a stored
15 video, where the encoding is done once and then decoding is done whenever the
16 video is viewed.

17 When a system is constructed to distribute digitized continuous media to
18 many users, there are a number of attractive opportunities for architectural
19 techniques which can reduce system load in addition to any gains achieved by
20 operations performed on the media such as efficient coding. In particular, a
21 powerful technique is *multicast*, where the information is not sent to all possible
22 recipients, but rather those who indicate interest, perhaps by subscription. To the
23 degree that sharing can be achieved, e.g., the sharing of a viewing service which

1 plays the video into the network, significant savings can be realized. For
2 example, rather than sending multiple copies of the same video stream, each at
3 1.5 megabits/second to a significant population of users, the video might be sent
4 once via multicast to the set.

5 Multicasts are typically represented as acyclic directed graphs called
6 *trees*, where the server lies at the root of the tree, there are a set of intermediate
7 *nodes* interconnected by network *links* which transport information to *leaf nodes*,
8 at which are located users. A key feature of the intermediate nodes is their ability
9 to replicate information to several nodes in the direction of the information flow,
10 so that eventually the information travels from the server to all interested leaves.

11 This basic model assumes that the users are all interested in receiving the
12 same information at the same time, *e.g.*, a “scheduled” time for a broadcast
13 event, such as a sports event or a concert. When users join the multicast at
14 some later time, they may lose the first part of the event (which they may be
15 interested in) as it is not saved (or “buffered”). For viewing of archived material,
16 such as replays of videos on demand, the points at which users are interested
17 and start the viewing will vary sufficiently that multiple time-skewed copies of the
18 digital continuous media may be being served to users at any given time.

19 The difficulties with this situation are two-fold. First, the server is busy
20 sending and resending multiple multicast streams of essentially the same
21 information. Second, the advantages of multicast accrue to the degree that
22 information is replicated – *unicast*, or point-to-point transmission, can be consider

1 a degenerate case of multicast, and in fact will be the case when there is no
2 shared interest in a continuous media stream. Thus, to the degree in which we
3 can aggregate demand for continuous media streams, we can optimize overall
4 system performance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

1 The novel features believed characteristic of the invention are set forth in the
2 appended claims. The invention itself however, as well as a preferred mode of use,
3 further objects and advantages thereof, will best be understood by reference to the
4 following detailed description of an illustrative embodiment when read in
5 conjunction with the accompanying drawings, wherein:

6 Figure 1 is a block diagram illustrating multicast over a network;

7 Figure 2 illustrates shared use of a buffer;

8 Figure 3 is a diagram illustrating use of a double buffer; and

9 Figure 4 is a timing diagram illustrating buffer sharing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENT

1 It will be appreciated by those skilled in the art that the following
2 description illustrates techniques that can be utilized in various types of systems.
3 The preferred embodiment is described in the context of an internet system such
4 as is generally known in the art.

5 MULTICAST TRAFFIC

6 In a store-and-forward packet-switched network, multicast is effected by
7 multicasting the packets of data as they arrive at a node in the multicast tree. In
8 practice, the node is a switch, router or other device which receives a multicast
9 packet on an input port, and sends the packet on one or more output ports in
10 accordance with the topology of the graph describing the multicast of the data to
11 users. A multicast from a server to a number of users is illustrated in **Figure 1**.

12 To perform this operation, the packet must be stored in a buffer memory.
13 In practice, the buffer memory may contain a *queue* of multiple packets. In the
14 continuous media case, a queue containing a sequence of packets represents a
15 segment of the continuous media stream. When the queue consists of large
16 numbers of packets, substantial storage of media can be achieved within the
17 constraints of the node's memory capacity.

18 While it is often the case that the buffering is mainly used to effect flow
19 control, that is, to mitigate rate differences between senders and receivers, the
20 presence of buffering capability in nodes allows other optimizations where the

1 buffer capacity, e.g., the queued packets, can be shared or reused effectively.
2 The advantage of sharing and reuse is that once the packet has been transmitted
3 to a buffer, it need not be transmitted from the server to service a user if the user
4 can be satisfied with the buffer contents rather than with an additional
5 independent stream sent by the server.

6 The difficulty in buffer reuse is independent start times for the multicast
7 streams, as what is in the queue of packets destined to a particular user may not
8 be the same data as that required by another user. To the degree that work (e.g.,
9 the transmission of data from one node to another) can be avoided through
10 sharing, the system will perform better. An example of better performance would
11 be more concurrent users operating with a reduction in bandwidth relative to
12 similar systems.

13 SHARED BUFFERS

14 Each segment of buffered continuous media represents the result of work done
15 by the network to transport the digitized continuous media to the buffer. Thus, to
16 the degree that the contents of the buffer can be shared, the work of transporting
17 the continuous media to the buffer can be shared. An essential observation is
18 that there is a clear relationship between buffer occupancy and time: each buffer
19 segment of size **B** bytes represents a playout time of **B/R** seconds, where **R** is
20 the encoding rate in bytes per second. A related observation was made in John
21 H. Shaffer, "The Effects of High Speed Networks on Wide Area Distributed
22 Systems", *Ph.D. Thesis*, CIS, University of Pennsylvania, 1996.

1 The central observation used in our approach is that if additional viewers
2 arrive within **B/R** seconds of the start time of the original playback, these additional
3 viewers can utilize the contents of the buffer segment rather than requiring
4 additional network bandwidth for transmission. To be specific, if the arrival time of
5 viewers V1 and V2 is separated by less than **B/R**, they can share a buffer
6 segment. This is illustrated in **Figure 2**.

7 While a related idea was employed in U. Legezda, D. Wetherall and J.
8 Guttag, "Active Reliable Multicast", Proc. Infocomm 1998, SF, CA to reduce
9 required bandwidth in a reliable multicast, the sharing was different, in that it was
10 used for recovery of lost multicast packets rather than as a support mechanism
11 for multicast of digital continuous media. The key basic point of our method is the
12 use of a per-recipient pointer (an index) into the shared buffer to reflect the
13 differences in start times. By use of this pointer, the buffer contents can be
14 effectively shared.

15 There are a variety of parameters which can be adjusted in the design of
16 such a system. First, to the degree that whole instances of digital continuous
17 media (for convenience, we will call these "files") can be buffered, there is
18 significant advantage to be had in that the buffer management algorithms are
19 simplified. This is because the algorithms need to spend less effort managing the
20 differences in buffer refresh rate caused by supporting multiple start times. This
21 management cost is incurred if the whole file is not available, as to save
22 bandwidth, the buffer contents must be retained until the last viewer is done with
23 them, *i.e.*, their pointer has advanced to the end of the buffer. This problem is

1 easily addressed if the well-known technique of *double-buffering* is employed to
2 manage two buffers of size **B** and the start time deltas are limited to **B/R**, as
3 above. In the double-buffering technique, one buffer is drained by the viewers
4 while the other is filled from the network, and this solution allows the time-
5 separated viewers to share the **2*B** space. The technique is illustrated in **Figure**
6 **3**.

7 The same effect can be achieved by limiting the time differences between
8 V1 and V2 to **B/(2*R)**.

9 OPTIMAL SHARING OF A SINGLE BUFFER

10 There are a variety of techniques for buffer management which can make
11 use of the buffer capacity to better store continuous digital media. To review
12 some of the techniques used in US Patent 5,754,938, issued May 19, 1998 to
13 Herz et al, and US Application No. 09/024,278, filed Feb 17, 1998, both hereby
14 incorporated by reference hereinto, the buffer contents can be:

- 15 1. Selected based on statistical modeling of the user based on similarity
16 measures derived from previous viewing.
- 17 2. Can be *prefetched* in advance of viewing demand in order to smooth
18 demands on bandwidth.
- 19 3. Can be *prefetched* in anticipation of possible viewing demand based on
20 similarity measures for the viewers sharing the buffer.

1 4. Can be *retained* in anticipation of new viewers requesting the stream
2 based on similarity measures for users sharing the buffer.

3 While we incorporate by reference the two Herz, *et al.* patents, we wish to
4 expand slightly here on point 4. This point suggests that the contents of a buffer
5 should be retained even after all current viewers have viewed the content *if* either
6 there is no demand for the space it is occupying from other content requests, or if
7 the likelihood that it will be used again soon is higher than the likelihood that any
8 prefetched content will be used soon. In effect, the retention decision is one
9 which takes advantage of the fact that a desirable prefetch is *already in the*
10 *buffer*. Excepting this observation, the similarity measures and analysis are
11 included by reference to the other patent and filing.

12 The single buffer case is then optimized by the following algorithm, applied
13 at each discrete time step in the buffer's existence:

14 1. If the buffer is being used by one or more viewers, examine another
15 buffer.

16 2. If the buffer has been used recently, estimate the probability that it will
17 be reused in the near future (e.g., a time interval such as **B/R**). If it is
18 likely, examine another buffer and mark the buffer "RETAINED".

19 3. If the buffer is marked "EMPTY", and a non-"DOUBLED BUFFERED"
20 buffer is being used by the maximum number of viewers, fetch the next

B bytes of the continuous media stream into the new buffer to achieve double buffering and mark both buffers "DOUBLE BUFFERED".

4. If the buffer is marked "EMPTY" and similarity measures show that prefetching more of the stream would optimize performance of the users of the buffer, mark the buffer "PREFETCHING" and request that a continuous media stream of **B/R** duration be sent to fill the buffer.

5. If a buffer is PREFETCHING and a buffer is required for on-demand traffic, mark the buffer "EMPTY".

6. If the buffer has been used, and it is unlikely to be reused in the near future, mark it "EMPTY".

7. If the buffer has not been used, mark it "EMPTY".

An interesting consequence of this algorithm is that highly popular data will be either completely prefetched or after prefetching and/or viewing, wholly retained. Thus, without explicitly requiring whole file caching, the system will naturally achieve it, and will do so on the basis of statistical usage and estimation measures.

There are additional gains to be made because streams are generally served over relatively lengthy periods of time and are consumed sequentially. This is especially true for such data types as audio and video programming. Because the full stream is delivered to a particular point, it is possible to predict content demand quite precisely for the following minutes or even hours.

1 Moreover, when geographically proximate nodes are conveying the same
2 stream, even at a time shift, it is possible for them to economize on upstream
3 bandwidth.

4 For example, if node N1 in the network is relaying frames from the FIRST
5 hour of Citizen Kane to one or more downstream users, then the probability is
6 extremely high that it will eventually have to relay frames from the SECOND hour
7 in Citizen Kane, and we can accurately estimate when it will have to do so.

8 If some nearby node N2 happens to have such frames in a buffer (e.g., N2
9 is already relaying the second hour), then it is cheap for N1 to get those frames.
10 This cheapness is temporary: N2 isn't going to keep the frames forever, so it may
11 make sense for N1 to immediately copy N2's frames – that is, to prefetch them.

12 In other words, N1 is getting its stream from the head end, but it is also
13 monitoring N2's stream and caching it for later. Eventually N1 will be able to
14 switch to the cache, at which point it can drop the head end.

15 Note that the streams don't need to be transmitted at the same speed at
16 which the user will consume them – with additional bandwidth, it would be
17 possible, for example, to send a node the remaining head end of a video stream
18 in a rapid burst. If multiple streams are being fed to a localized cluster of nodes,
19 such a bursting strategy would allow the many streams to be rapidly collapsed
20 into very few (if not one) shared streams, greatly decreasing bandwidth use by
21 the locale.

1 More complex probabilistic strategies are also possible, with each node
2 participating in a self-organized market, requesting and taking bids for slices of
3 bandwidth.

4 OPTIMAL SYSTEM DESIGN WITH BUFFERS AND SERVERS

5 It is obvious that the scheme can be applied to a server with a single
6 buffer. When a more complex system, such as that in **Figure 1** is constructed,
7 the buffers can be viewed as a shared resource and as multiple layers of
8 intermediate capability. In such a system, we can use a hierarchical scheme, so
9 that individual viewers using a single buffer are replaced by multiple viewers
10 sharing a buffer, which in turn shares buffers in the multicast tree. Further, the
11 buffers can cooperate amongst themselves to share caching capacity, and
12 further, the similarity measures of the patents included by reference can be
13 localized to the population of viewers near the particular buffer. In such a case,
14 the population statistics are localized. Caches that are higher in the tree (nearer
15 to the server) aggregate more and more traffic, but have better models of user
16 demand from the aggregated demand of the buffers which are presenting
17 aggregated demand to them.

18 Additionally, multiple servers can be used. In this case, buffers may
19 communicate with multiple servers based on the demands of their users, and
20 prefetch information based both on user interest and aggregated interest, and
21 capacity of the server being used.

1 The advantage of these architectural advances for scaling is significant.
2 Information in caches near the edges of the system is localized to the user
3 interests represented by the similarity measures applied to the continuous digital
4 media or descriptive information associated with it. Each level of buffering in the
5 hierarchical multicast demand aggregates various levels of interest and optimism
6 in prefetching data: data prefetched by many buffer caches on behalf of their
7 clients/viewers will be more likely to be buffer resident where higher levels of
8 aggregation ensue.

9 VI Demand Aggregation of Data Streams as an Optimally Bandwidth Conserving 10 Form of Pre-Fetching

11 The following technical methodology describing similarity-informed pre-
12 fetching (the subject of a co-pending patent application by the inventors of the
13 presently disclosed invention) provides an underlying technical framework for the
14 object of the novel innovative concept introduced within this section which is the
15 aggregation of data streams based upon capitalizing upon aggregate demand
16 prediction of a sub-population of users who are imminently likely to request a
17 particular file (a standard file or a streaming file). Similarity-informed pre-fetching
18 provides a fundamental technical basis for demand aggregation of down-loaded
19 data streams with a few fundamental differences as are explained further below.

20 Bandwidth is greater at the root end of a hierarchical node network
21 system, in anticipation of a request, it is prudent to use the similarity measure to
22 predictively cache files into local servers and further to narrow-cast selections

1 into given distribution cells and (hierarchical) sub-cells through sub-servers
2 based on what selections are most likely to be requested in each cell so as to
3 significantly increase the utilization of bandwidth via this hierarchical narrow-cast
4 configuration. The importance of this savings appears in proportion to the degree
5 of granularity (smallness of the cell) in the narrow-cast architecture. This
6 technique can also be used to make decisions for scheduling what data should
7 be placed on dedicated channels. This may be more network-efficient if a file
8 were popular enough to be continuously in the queue because upon submission
9 of a request a file may be partially downloaded regardless of where in the length
10 of the file the download began. The (initially) missed portion of the file can then
11 be immediately picked up as the file narrow-cast starts over, thus completing the
12 download in the same time period as if a special request for the file were made.
13 Mobile users whose geographic locations are known can have files pre-cached
14 (e.g. at night) into the servers which are presently physically closest to them at
15 any given time.

16 The present data distribution system employs the idea of pre-fetching,
17 which has also been referred to as pre-caching, cache-pre-loading, or
18 anticipation in the technical literature. The basic idea is that if good predictions of
19 future data requirements are available, and there is excess data-fetching
20 capability available, the data should be fetched aggressively in anticipation of
21 future needs. If successful, this technique has two major benefits applicable to
22 present and future networks. First, it can reduce (i.e., improve) response-time, a
23 major performance advantage in interactive systems. Second, it can reduce

1 congestion and other problems associated with network overload. To
2 understand how the responsiveness of the system is improved, the unused
3 bandwidth can be used to transmit information likely to be used in the future. For
4 example, if a list is being traversed 1,2,3,4, it is likely that if object N has been
5 requested, that object N+1 will be the next request. If N+1 is pre-fetched from
6 the remote system, it will be available when the request is made with additional
7 delays. All of the "UNUSED BANDWIDTH" can potentially be used to pre-fetch.

8 Within the context of the pending patent on the pre-fetching concept
9 entitled "Broadcast Data Distribution System with Asymmetric Uplink/Downlink
10 Bandwidths" one of the key objectives is it involves the use of pre-fetching as a
11 congestion control technique as if we pre-fetch successfully during more lightly
12 loaded periods (such as $TIME=0.42$), we reduce the probability of data being
13 requested in the futures, essentially trading the guarantee of a fully loaded
14 network today for the promise of no congestion in the future. By fetching data in
15 anticipation of future needs, we reduce (at least probabilistically) those future
16 needs.

17 Pre-fetching has been used in the computer operating systems field for
18 several decades, and a variety of algorithms have been explored. A. J. Smith of
19 Berkeley has reported that the only case where successful predictions about
20 future requests for memory objects can be made is when accesses are
21 sequential. More recent work for higher-level content such as World-Wide Web
22 (WWW) hypertext has shown that user-authored links to other hypermedia
23 documents can be followed with some success.

1 The pre-fetching technology which the inventors of this disclosure have
2 previously invented is based on unused slots being filled with pre-sent
3 information based on our understanding of user interest using the similarity
4 measures developed in the issued patent entitled "System for Generation of User
5 Profiles for a System for Customized Electronic Identification of Desirable
6 Objects" (US Patent 5,754,939) and used for our prioritization (see p. 18 of the
7 above-referenced invention disclosure), a concept that they do not deal with, as
8 they follow http: links based on observations about the high probability that these
9 links will be followed by users.

10 The pre-fetching invention may be usefully applied within the context of
11 set-top box like devices such as personal digital assistants or network
12 computers, or personal computers used as a form of set-top box as well as any
13 type of "fat client" as a method of reducing response time as observed by users.
14 This method used "links" to other documents embedded in an HTTP-format file
15 as hints that those links should be followed in pre-fetching data; that is, the linked
16 documents should be fetched in anticipation of the user's desire to follow the
17 links to those documents.

18 The present invention provides two enhancements to this scheme. First, it
19 provides a technological means by which the pre-fetched data can be intermixed
20 with on-demand data to provide overall improvements in response time to a large
21 population of HTTP/WWW users, with reduced memory requirements. Second,
22 t-he present invention, which views the down-link as a fixed capacity resource,
23 provides a general scheduling method embodying techniques such as user

1 preferences to pre-fetch when slots or bandwidth are underutilized, to
2 preemptively reduce future demand for bandwidth.

3 In addition, the similarity measures which suggest:

- 4 1. An anticipated behavioral similarity between different though metrically
5 "similar" users may be used to further analyze other previous user's
6 on-line behavior as well as,
- 7 2. Page similarity to other links, which the user has an explicitly or
8 implicitly (predicted) affinity towards, may be a technique to further
9 improve predictive accuracy as to which of the available links the user
10 is probabilistically most likely to imminently select next (compare to
11 aggregatively using the overall popularity of those links).

12 The general technique of using similarity-informed pre-fetching is
13 described at length in US patent entitled "Pseudonymous Server For System For
14 Customized Electronic Identification Of Desirable Objects", U.S. Patent No.
15 5,754,938 filed October 31, 1995, issued May 19, 1998.

16 The technique of data-streams is based upon a similar variation of the
17 type of similarity-informed pre-fetching, which is performed on a relatively
18 dynamic basis as suggested below. A couple of fundamental extensions to the
19 basic technique are added, however. Unlike dynamic similarity-based pre-
20 fetching, because there is a certain degree of predictive error, which invariably
21 occurs though the present techniques attempt to anticipate imminently

1 forthcoming file requests on the part of the user (and where the error rate
2 exponentially increases in proportion to the length of the anticipatory period), the
3 basic goal of this dynamic pre-fetching is increasing speed of user access to
4 page requests at the expense of the additional bandwidth, which is consumed as
5 a result. However, in the case of data stream aggregation the key objective is to
6 minimize bandwidth utilization. This approach also results in the ability to not
7 adversely affect speed of access to the data. Although its use is in no way
8 limited, it is likely that the present approach to pre-fetching basic data stream
9 aggregation may be particularly well suited for delivering data to the leaf end
10 nodes of the network

11 Compared to similarity-based pre-fetching, the key modification in the
12 basic method (and certainly technical challenge) of pre-fetching based data
13 stream aggregation is the following:

14 In similarity-based dynamic pre-fetching (as suggested above), the
15 similarity measurements of the predictive data model anticipates, on a dynamic
16 basis, the forthcoming file request actions of the user. In fact the outputs, i.e.,
17 probabilities of a given user requesting any given file, can be measured as a
18 function of time (T). If this measurement is based upon the entire subset of that
19 user population which has at least some non-zero probability of imminently
20 selecting that file, we, in turn, may determine the aggregate probability of that file
21 to be requested by the entire user sub-population (i.e., which is serviced by a
22 particular data distribution server) as a function of time. Of course, in
23 accordance with the probabilistic model, this aggregate probability curve (of

1 average likelihood of the user population to initiate the request) changes on a
2 moment to moment basis changes in accordance with further behavioral
3 feedback of the sub-population as time (t) approaches the average
4 (probabilistically most likely) time for overall demand for that file to culminate
5 (however, this value remains fixed for our purposes as once a pre-fetching
6 decision has been made any subsequent probability shifts are irrelevant). The
7 point in time at which a data stream is scheduled to initiate is T_1 and the end is
8 T_2 . There is another important relationship which is within a given average
9 probability measure the actual time from the point in time which is that moment
10 that the user population on average is anticipated to actually request the file. We
11 will call this value T_{b1} . The end of that period is called T_{b2} . We want to also
12 determine the average effective available memory of each relevant user's client's
13 local buffer, however, this value is also affected by such variables which compete
14 for this space such as how much of this memory had been pre-allowed to long-
15 term pre-fetching (the relative proportions of such allocation of which would be
16 determined through experimentation and may be network specific) and how
17 much "risk diversification" is provided for i.e., the probability distribution for any
18 given individual at any give instant in time (t) preceeding an actual request is very
19 likely to contain secondarily another (or other) file(s) with some non-zero
20 probability. Thus the total probability (and possibly relative probability)
21 determines available buffer memory for the present anticipated file request. For
22 purposes of the present estimation, this value is called ΔT_b and is measured as
23 the amount of time that the present effective available memory buffer for that

1 client is able to receive the data stream associated with the present anticipated
2 forthcoming request.

3 We then want to select a time T to actually request the file for delivery to
4 all the relevant users U based upon the average of the product of probability (of
5 making the desired relevant file request) (P_b) and time such that T_1 's value is
6 such that period.

7 $T_1 - T_2$ provides the maximum possible product of probability and time for
8 all relevant clients' buffers collectively (that are able to concurrently co-exist
9 within period $T_1 - T_2$). (the fixed value describing the period of the data stream)
10 Based upon these variables the key technical challenge of pre-fetching-based
11 data stream aggregation is determining values of $T_1 - T_2$ which achieve
12 optimality in reducing bandwidth consumption in the multi-cast of that particular
13 data stream. This is represented in Fig. 4 by our attempt to find a T_1 value
14 optimizing the area described by probability and time within the $T_1 - T_2$ period.

15 The following equation is provided:

16
$$(T_1 - T_2) = \{\Delta T_b P_b Z + (\Delta T_b + 1) (P_b + 1)(Z + 1) + \dots\}(\text{mean average})$$

17 where Z is the percentage of $T_{b1} - T_{b2}$ which overlaps with $T_1 - T_2$.

18 Fig. 4 depicts graphically how a key objective of the above equation is to
19 find a $T_1 - T_2$ value which maximizes the (2 D) area under the various client
20 buffers collectively in a probability time graph.

1 Finally, in light of the present technique because the predictive models are
2 prone to a certain degree of oversight, i.e., not anticipating the forthcoming
3 request actions certain uses for a given file or not the accurate timing therefore
4 (e.g., not anticipating the request action soon enough) there will invariably exist
5 certain inefficiencies in the present model in which certain user request data
6 streams are not properly (or not at all) aggregated, thus, we would like to provide
7 yet another additional solution to more efficiently aggregate these inefficiently
8 transmitted streams. The idea is that if a local client buffer has failed to initiate
9 download of a stream (or has initiated it after its initialization, we can effectively
10 re-transmit the "missed" portion of the stream to the new requester at a very fast
11 rate (e.g., if it is streaming media content, considerably faster than real-time) up
12 until the point in which the data received by the new requester "catches up" with
13 the original stream at which time both the new requester and original requester(s)
14 then share the same stream for the remainder of its duration. In such an event
15 the bandwidth utilization specifically allocated to that missed portion of the file we
16 could say becomes "bursty". Due to the somewhat different mechanism of both
17 data stream aggregation methods, in trying to achieve optimal bandwidth
18 utilization the degree to which this additional approach to aggregation should be
19 relied upon compared to the original pre-fetching based approach (that is to say
20 from a probabilistic standpoint how speculatively do we want to pre-fetch versus
21 rely upon effectively the present ("fall-back") approach of using burstiness of
22 transmission to compensate for the resulting "missed" requests of the predictive
23 (anticipatory) approach. This balance between the degree of utilization of these

1 two methods may also be a bit subjective in as much as if bandwidth is (presently)
2 overly constrained, the system may automatically adjust by relying more heavily
3 upon the original technique of pre-fetching based data stream aggregation (and
4 certainly even more towards artificial delays in as much as bursty data stream
5 aggregation while involving no delays in initiating does involve some degree of
6 extra bandwidth utilization during the "bursts". Of course, as part of this pre-
7 fetching procedure and (relatedly) the) the number of files provided a given
8 probability distribution for forthcoming requests of those files must also be
9 determined through further experimentation.

10 In another form of data stream aggregation called "artificial delays",
11 described further below, speed of access to the user is invariably compromised
12 in direct proportion to the degree of data stream aggregation which is desired for
13 reducing bandwidth. In the presently described version of data stream
14 aggregation (as is also true in the case of artificial delays), although it may be
15 variable, on the average, the number of users serviced by the data distribution
16 server as well as the degree of popularity of the particular file being presently
17 requested by the user relative to that particular population of users, is directly
18 proportional to the speed of access by the user to that particular requested file.
19 Accordingly, non-dynamic pre-fetching (also detailed above), because it is both
20 non-dynamic in nature and also achieves a reduction in overall network traffic
21 can be used in combination with the present pre-fetching based data stream
22 aggregation in order to provide an optimally efficient traffic reduced network
23 environment, and as is further described below there are further bandwidth

1 reduction optimization techniques which allow for the approach between the
2 intermediate node and leaf end of the network while allowing for non-dynamic
3 similarity-informed pre-caching and the most bandwidth efficient data stream
4 aggregation technique, i. e., artificial delays to occur on nodes close to "trunk"
5 portion of the network where the potential number of user connections
6 represented is extremely large and thus potential for bandwidth conservation,
7 using artificial delays is extremely great. On the other hand, if near the leaf end
8 of the network further bandwidth conservation is desired, it is even possible to
9 provide the technique of artificial delays in combination with static pre-caching
10 and dynamic pre-fetching based data stream aggregation. And this approach
11 may be particularly compelling in achieving substantial bandwidth conservation if
12 the end-user population (or number of network "leaves") is quite large.

13 Artificial Delays

14 This note discusses the notion of "artificial delays" in the queuing of
15 requests for the satellite or cable system to which our set top boxes are attached.
16 The idea is that by careful management of the queues, we can effect significant
17 bandwidth savings for the system as a whole. If you will remember, the Server
18 scheduling algorithm (I've attached the text for it from the DBS scheme I sent
19 during the Summer at the end of this e-mail) goes like this:

20 The client set-top box (of which there should be many) sends REQUESTs
21 for information in cell-sized units to the server system. The server system applies
22 a priority algorithm (see especially Step 10, below) to CHOOSE the next cell to

1 send. By design of the relative priorities, we can get good responsiveness and
2 reduced bandwidth needs, in spite of the low memory needs (and low cost) of the
3 set top boxes.

4 Imagine the scenario where there are MANY set tops connected to the
5 server. This situation might be where the Cs are Clients and the S is a Server.
6 Now clearly, there is a multiplicity of Clients, and by virtue of this multiplicity, we
7 may be able to achieve a savings through appropriate delays. I again believe the
8 similarity measure is the key to success here, and to novelty. Consider the cell
9 requests for Clients C1, C4 and C5, shown below using letters to indicate
10 particular cells as discussed in our disclosure text.

11 C1: E-T-A-O-I-N-S-H-R-D-L-U.....

12 C4: N-A-T-I-O-N-A-L-V-E-L.....

13 C5: E-A-T-O-N-L-Y-S-U-D.....

14 We mark these cell request with times associated with their transmission
15 intervals:

16 T:

17 I:0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1

18 M:1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-0-1-2-3.....

19 E:

20 Now, for convenience, assume that all of the cell requests show above
21 have the same priority. Then the server might actually send the following
22 sequence of cells over the channel:

1 S:E-N-E-T-A-A-A-T-T-O-I-O.....

2 Thus, we are servicing the cell requests C1-C4-C5-C1-C4-C5..... (in fact,
3 the Server may notice the overlaps between requests by C1 and C5 in the first
4 interval, C4 and C5 in the second interval, C4 and C5 in the third interval, and C1
5 and C5 in the fourth interval, giving:

6 S:E-N-T-A-A-T-O-I-I-O-N-N...

7)

8 Imagine that the clients are always listening. Then, we can delay cell
9 requests in the HOPE that the REPLYs can be MERGED, satisfying multiple set-
10 top-box clients with the same REPLY. To make this concrete, consider delaying
11 service by one period. So the output of the server then looks like:

12 S:#-E-N-T-A-O-I-N-L-S-A-Y....

13 What is going on here is very subtle. By delaying some clients service
14 requests, we are INCREASING THE PROBABILITY that another such request
15 will come in, which can we can fold into service of the equivalent delayed
16 request. The cost is potentially in delay, but with enough overlap, the cell times
17 are short enough for 48 bytes on a DBS channel that we can probably delay
18 significantly.

19 Considering the problem theoretically for a moment, we can compute the
20 gain for the an acceptable delay D as being the number of redundant
21 transmissions which are eliminated due to a delay D. So, for delays of from 1 to

1 10 cell times the total number of DBS cells without redundancy checks is 30; the
2 number required when this small optimization is applied is as shown below:

3 Delay DBS CellsBandwidth Savings

4 -----

5 $02430/24=25\%$

6 $11830/18=66\%$

7 $21730/17=76\%$

8 $31730/17=76\%$

9 $41530/15=100\%$

10 $51530/15=100\%$

11 $61530/15=100\%$

12 $71530/15=100\%$

13 $81530/15=100\%$

14 $91530/15=100\%$

15 $101430/14=114\%$

16 We compute the bandwidth gain against the dumb use of 30 cell times;
17 the bandwidth gain comes from the fact that the synchronous satellite channel
18 gives us a fixed bandwidth, giving a fixed number of cells per unit time, and we
19 have just saved 16 cell times by use of the delay scheme. For this example, at
20 this point no more gain is possible, since all the duplication has been eliminated.
21 In some sense, this behaves like a compression scheme. The similarity
22 algorithm increases the probability that these overlaps will occur - the ideal
23 situation is we are waiting long enough so that the scheduled broadcast cell

1 satisfies almost all requests for that cell within a significant time intervals (say
2 several milliseconds).

3 Optimal Stream-Handling Techniques as a Function of Node Location in the 4 Network.

5 The method by which streams are handled depends in part on a node's
6 location in the network.

7 A node close to the network's "trunk" will often be best served by artificial
8 delays and pre-caching techniques, whereas nodes closer to the network's
9 "leaves" more efficiently make use of demand aggregation and pre-fetching.

10 The particular topology of a given network will determine the distance a
11 node must be from the center in order for the "leaf" approaches to be more
12 appropriate than the "trunk" approaches.

13 Long-Term vs. Short-Term Pre-Caching –

14 Due to the relative importance of responsiveness compared to relative
15 bandwidth savings opportunities at the edges (leaf ends) of the network compared
16 to the trunk , dynamic pre-fetching (and pre-fetching-based data stream
17 aggregation) may be efficiently utilized near the network edges while more static
18 (long-term) pre-caching)may be more appropriate closer to the trunk nodes of the
19 network. Also at this trunk level because the number of repetitive requests artificial
20 delay based data aggregation is very efficient and because of the rather large

1 storage capacity associated with this repetitive file traffic, long-term pre-caching is
2 certainly ideal.

3 Automatic Adaptive Shifting to Other Techniques –

4 E. g., if/when traffic congestion and slow down at the edges occurs, it may
5 be prudent to shift the relative degree of utilization of one technique to another ,
6 e.g., in the present scenario the use of artificial delays may be able to
7 significantly reduce delays through relieving congestion. Pre-fetching-based data
8 stream aggregation may also provide useful advantages.

9 As a result, different levels in the network have different traffic and storage
10 characteristics (and relative responsiveness priorities). The selection and relative
11 dependence upon one of the above techniques versus another may be different
12 at these different levels and the desirable optimizations requiring different uses
13 and priorities of these various techniques may change at any given level in the
14 network and at any given time based upon these dynamically changing
15 characteristics of the network traffic (to the extent that these dynamic
16 characteristic changes are not pre-determinable using existing network traffic
17 intelligence solutions).

18 Likewise, because both probability and statistical confidence (degree of
19 certainty) varies even between different files which are predictively anticipated
20 (using pre-fetching-based data stream aggregation), the use of this method (the
21 degree of reliance) of this method, may vary even between anticipated file
22 request, e.g., it may be advantageous if the probability of a file being requested

1 is low or the statistical confidence of a file (even the most "likely" file) to make the
2 anticipatory period for requesting that file low (i.e., less speculative) in order to rely
3 more upon bursty data stream aggregation (or artificial delays particularly in these
4 latter two techniques the period of anticipation may be ideally further minimized
5 if/when these other techniques are utilized with higher relative importance.

6 Consideration for Pre-Fetching Based Data Stream Aggregation –

7 In addition, because data stream pre-fetching aggregation is a very important
8 technique for providing bandwidth conservation (an important need for the leaf
9 ends of the network), while also providing a high degree of responsiveness to
10 requests, it may also be important to insure that the appropriate technique (or
11 combination of techniques) as suggested above is utilized to insure that files
12 reach this bandwidth bottleneck in the network, (e.g., the intermediate node just
13 prior to leaf end node) such that pre-fetching data stream aggregation at this
14 level can occur extremely efficiently without unnecessary efficiency
15 consequences resulting from delays higher up in the network (e. g., this may be
16 especially true in the case of the wireless network example).

17 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

18 1. Streaming vs. Static Files

19 This description has been focused mainly on streaming types of data.
20 However, packet analysis at the backbone level could identify metrically close
21 data transmissions of any sort (that is, streaming or static ("static" meaning non-

streaming). Thus, when two proximate nodes download the same extremely large data file of a non-streaming sort, they could use a shared buffer to reduce their external need of bandwidth to a single connection. In the end, this architecture handles files of both the streaming and static types in very much the same way.

2. Tradeoffs between Bandwidth and Memory

In all of these examples, there is a continuous tradeoff between bandwidth and memory: if a great deal of bandwidth is available, there is little need for localized buffers – every user can afford an individual real-time connection and therefore has no need to store any streams. On the other hand, if a great deal of memory is available, the permanent storage of all incoming streams to a local server would eventually reduce the need for external bandwidth.

EXEMPLARY APPLICATIONS

The network architecture described in this patent can be embodied in many relevant applications. Note that although a few are described here, the architecture is generally applicable to any situation in which multiple proximate (relative to the network) users will potentially access the same stream of data within some period of time.

1. Neighborhood Server

A subdivision of homes is linked by high-bandwidth lines to a shared, local server which acts as the neighborhood's central portal to the Internet. Using

1 residents' video preference profiles, the server predicts which movies or
2 television programs are most likely to be requested as downloads, and buffers
3 (for example) the first ½ hour of the 50 most likely selections to local memory.
4 This could best be done during the day, when residents are more likely to be at
5 work, temporally smoothing the neighborhood's demand for bandwidth.

6 In the evening, if a resident happens to select a video stream which has
7 already been front-loaded in the local server, he is sent data directly from the
8 local buffer. If no other resident requests the same program, the single user is
9 switched to an external stream when the buffer has been exhausted. However, if
10 several residents select the same program at roughly the same time (that is,
11 within the ½ hour buffer), the server continuously downloads (and buffers) a
12 window of streamed data that spans the users' timings. For example, Resident A
13 starts watching Citizen Kane; for the first ½ hour he is initially fed a stream from
14 the local server. Suppose 5 minutes later Resident B also starts to watch Citizen
15 Kane. When A reaches the end of the ½ hour buffer, the neighborhood server
16 starts to draw Citizen Kane as a stream directly from the internet, pushing it to A
17 directly, and then saving the stream to a continuously-refreshed five-minute
18 buffer. B is fed from the end of the buffer, just before the stream is finally cleared
19 from memory. In this way, rather than opening two high-bandwidth connections
20 to the Internet, the local neighborhood server needs only open a single high-
21 bandwidth connection and allocate enough memory in its local buffer to hold five
22 minutes of video programming. When multiple residents watch the same

1 programming at fairly similar times, this method greatly reduces the subdivision's
2 overall need for external bandwidth.

3 Note too that peer-to-peer (P2P) methods could be used to expand the
4 neighborhood's available storage – the neighborhood server would be given
5 permission by residents to temporarily make use of memory or hard disk space
6 that they are not currently using on their own home machines. This would
7 expand the number of stream front-ends that could be prefetched.

8 2. Demand Aggregation for Wireless Electronics

9 Demand aggregation techniques would also be useful in the case of
10 wireless devices -- if many users in a particular locale exhibit similar data needs
11 (such as Wall Street executives checking popular stock prices periodically),
12 bandwidth could be conserved by continuously sending the information in a
13 single stream to a server connected to the local wireless transmitter.

14 3. Optimization of Web Page Delivery

15 While a user peruses a given Web page, it would be possible to prefetch
16 many of the pages to which his current page is currently linked. Then, when the
17 user clicks a hyperlink, because his selection is already in the local buffer it can
18 be delivered almost instantly. Obviously, this could be made more sophisticated,
19 with probabilistic methods used to determine which pages are most likely to next
20 be chosen by the user, and thus which are the most logical candidates for
21 prefetching.

1 While the invention has been particularly shown and described with
2 reference to a preferred embodiment, it will be understood by those skilled in the art
3 that various changes in form and detail may be made therein without departing from
4 the spirit and scope of the invention.

5

0635MH-40913 Patent Application